

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/811,658	VRANA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Katherine W. Mitchell	3677	

**All Participants:**

(1) Katherine W. Mitchell.

(2) Mr. G. DeGrazia.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 17 June 2024

**Time:** various

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*no*

**Claims discussed:**

*all*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*no*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's response to the Quayle included broadening terms and introduced ambiguity into the application. Main concern was the V-shaped bottom wall needed to be recited, not the groove, and "a groove" could not become plural grooves, and there could not be 2 distinct grooves of different geometry and function both referred to as linear grooves. An examiner's amendment (attached) spelled out the corrections needed.